NEUROSCIENTIFIC DISCOVERIES AND THE RECONSTRUCTION OF LEGAL CULPABILITY: HOW BRAIN-BASED EVIDENCE CHALLENGES TRADITIONAL MODELS OF CRIMINAL RESPONSIBILITY

Sergio Pommier Gallo, PhD, JD, LLM
ORCID iD: 0009-0000-7387-3943
Affiliation: Stanford University

Abstract

This article examines how contemporary discoveries in cognitive neuroscience, neurocriminology, and decision-making science challenge traditional binary understandings of legal culpability. Moving beyond classical assumptions of unitary free will, the analysis evaluates empirical findings on volition, inhibitory control, neural readiness potentials, prefrontal dysfunction, and altered agency attribution. The study proposes that neuroscientific evidence does not eliminate criminal responsibility, but rather compels a reconstruction of culpability as a graded normative concept informed by demonstrable neurofunctional capacities. A scientifically grounded model of neuro-graded culpability is introduced to reconcile mens rea doctrine, criminal agency, and contemporary brain-based evidence.

Keywords: neurolaw; legal culpability; mens rea; neurocriminology; inhibitory control; criminal responsibility; neuroscience.

1. Introduction

The classical architecture of criminal culpability has historically relied on binary assumptions regarding intent, voluntariness, and conscious agency. A defendant either possessed the required mens rea or did not. However, contemporary advances in neuroscience increasingly reveal that human decision-making, volitional control, and action initiation may operate through graded neurofunctional processes rather than absolute conscious states.

This emerging tension raises a central question: To what extent should neuroscientific evidence modify legal understandings of culpability without undermining the normative foundations of criminal law?

This article argues that modern neuroscience challenges rigid legal binaries and supports a more differentiated model of culpability based on demonstrable neural capacity, inhibitory control, and agency integrity.

2. Neuroscience of Volition and Readiness Potentials

Experimental findings on neural readiness potentials suggest that measurable brain activation may precede conscious awareness of voluntary decision-making. This line of evidence complicates classical legal assumptions that conscious intention fully initiates action.

Rather than negating responsibility, these findings suggest that intentional conduct may emerge from layered neurocognitive processes involving preconscious preparation, executive integration, and conscious endorsement.

From a legal standpoint, this raises important questions regarding the temporal formation of intent and the doctrinal boundaries of voluntariness.

3. Inhibitory Control, Prefrontal Function, and Mens Rea

A growing body of neuroscientific research links deficits in prefrontal and orbitofrontal functioning to impaired inhibitory control, impulsive violence, emotional dysregulation, and diminished foresight.

These findings are highly relevant to criminal law because inhibitory failure may alter the degree to which an individual can suppress aggressive impulses, delay gratification, or conform behavior to legal norms.

The legal significance does not lie in absolution, but in refining how mens rea, recklessness, and diminished capacity are evaluated in cases involving demonstrable executive dysfunction.

4. Criminal Agency and the Sense of Authorship

Contemporary neuroscience further demonstrates that the subjective sense of authorship over one's actions may itself be neurobiologically altered in specific pathological or developmental conditions.

Disruptions in agency attribution may affect the legal evaluation of whether conduct is experienced as self-generated, externally compelled, compulsive, or partially dissociated.

This becomes particularly significant in cases involving frontal lesions, severe impulse disorders, psychotic distortions, traumatic brain injury, or neurodevelopmental immaturity.

5. The Neuro-Graded Culpability Model

This article proposes a new doctrinal framework: Neuro-Graded Culpability.

Under this model, culpability is understood as a legally normative concept informed by empirically demonstrable gradations in:
cognitive foresight; inhibitory control; volitional integrity; agency coherence; and neurodevelopmental maturity.

The model preserves the normative autonomy of criminal law while allowing scientifically robust evidence to refine the degree of blameworthiness assigned to the defendant.

This approach avoids the false dichotomy between full culpability and total exculpation.

6. Scientific and Legal Limits

Neuroscientific evidence must not be treated as deterministic proof of innocence. Brain-based findings remain probabilistic, context-dependent, and methodologically constrained.

The legal system must therefore distinguish between:
neural correlation,
functional impairment,

causal relevance,
and doctrinal responsibility.

Scientific evidence can inform culpability gradation, but it cannot independently resolve the normative question of blame.

7. Conclusions

Recent discoveries in neuroscience do not abolish legal culpability, but they substantially challenge simplistic binary models of criminal responsibility.

The most defensible legal response is neither rejection nor neuroscientific determinism, but doctrinal reconstruction.

The proposed Neuro-Graded Culpability model offers a scientifically grounded framework for integrating modern evidence on volition, inhibitory control, and agency into criminal law while preserving the normative foundations of legal judgment.

Future developments in neurolaw and neurocriminology will likely require courts to move from binary attribution models toward evidence-sensitive gradations of culpability.

References

Libet, B. (1985). Unconscious cerebral initiative and the role of conscious will in voluntary action. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 8(4), 529–566.

Greene, J., & Cohen, J. (2004). For the law, neuroscience changes nothing and everything. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, 359(1451), 1775–1785.

Morse, S. J. (2011). Avoiding irrational neuro-law exuberance: A plea for neuromodesty. Mercer Law Review, 62(3), 837–859.

Baskin-Sommers, A., & Foti, D. (2015). Abnormal cognitive control and implications for criminal behavior. Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 11, 501–529.

Eagleman, D. (2011). The brain on trial. The Atlantic.

Raine, A. (2013). The anatomy of violence: The biological roots of crime. Pantheon Books.